

Remarks

Claim Rejections 35 U.S.C. §102

Kirsch is concerned with measuring the effectiveness of an advertisement on a web page. Kirsch explains at column 2 lines 43 to 49 that, "A more direct measure of the effectiveness of a particular advertisement on a particular web page is the number of times a client web browser chooses to actively pursue the URL represented by the advertisement. Thus there is a need to be able to track information obtainable from a client browser when a hyper-linked advertiser's URL is selected."

Consider that the advertisement is provided on a host web page provided by server A. Consider also that the advertisement contains a URL to information hosted on a destination server B. The method of Kirsch provides that the advertisement contains a URL pointing back to server A instead of server B. Thus server A is aware of all requests to access the information on server B via the advertisement. That is server A is able to assess the effectiveness of the advertisement. Also server A is able to seamlessly re-direct the client to server B using the information in the received URL. This is explained in Kirsch at column 6 line 52 to column 7 line 40 and claim 1 of Kirsch.

Server A is hereinafter taken to always be a URL source server since it is the server providing the URL to which it is required to re-direct the client (for example, to find information relating to the advertisement).

The present invention also involves re-directing a client. However, the object of the present invention and the method of achieving this are not taught in Kirsch.

In Kirsch the URL source server, server A, needs to have knowledge about destination server, server B. In contrast, a primary object of the present invention is to avoid the need for this knowledge. In the present invention the source server, server A is for example a web-based information system providing

telephone numbers. The destination server, server B, is for example a web server 306 (see Figure 3) for initiating a telephone call from the user's telephone 304 to a telephone number selected by the user from the web-based information system. In the present invention server A has no knowledge about server B. The present invention thus enables new services to be provided such as phone number white pages with active URLs that activate the client's standard telephone and cause it to automatically out-dial to that number.

Claim 10 is therefore not anticipated by Kirsch. The Examiner is presumably arguing that the web-based information system of claim 10 is the source server A of Kirsch hosting advertisements which are presumably the items of information. A user is able to operate a web-browser to access and select an advertisement. In that case a URL pointing back to the source server A is activated, that URL containing the URL reference to the information on server B. Thus the source server A of Kirsch does not have feature (ii) of claim 10. In Kirsch the URL is forwarded to server A, not to a web-browser. Also, claim 10 now specifies that the web-based information system has no information about the information receiver. This is not the case in Kirsch as explained above.

Independent claims 12, 15 and 18 are similarly amended and are allowable over Kirsch for the same reasons as for claim 10.

Independent claim 19 is not anticipated by Kirsch because Kirsch does not teach generating cookies as specified. None of the passages referenced by the Examiner in paragraph 8 of the office action mention the word "cookie". Also in Kirsch the user accesses server A using the web-browser and this is not the information receiver as in step (i) of claim 19.

#### Claim Rejections 35 U.S.C. §103

Claim 1 is amended to make it clear that the first web-entity, which can be the web-based information system, has no information about any of the second web-

entities (such as information receivers in Figure 3 of the present application). As explained above this is a key feature of the present invention.

In contrast, Kirsch uses a first web-entity (web server hosting advertisement) which does have information about the single second web-entity (destination server hosting further information relating to the advertisement). Also Kirsch does not teach step (i) of claim 1 because in Kirsch the URL and embedded address is sent to server A, not to a web browser. Presumably the Examiner is arguing that the "additional information" of claim 1 is the address of server B. In that case step (iii) of claim 1 would not make sense. The Examiner's reading of Kirsch onto claim 1 is therefore unclear.

If the skilled person had considered Narendran he would not have been able to reach the present invention. Narendran uses known web-server redirection to a single alternative server method (HTTP redirection) and extends that to multiple destination servers for the purposes of load balancing and fault tolerance. In Narendran the redirection server has to have full knowledge of all of the destination servers. In contrast a key feature of the present invention is to prevent the need for such knowledge. Kirsch also requires such knowledge as explained above. Therefore combining Kirsch and Narendran cannot lead to the present invention.

The remaining claims are patentable by virtue of their dependency. Although the Examiner's rejections of those claims are not specifically addressed here, those rejections are not accepted.

Further and favorable reconsideration of the application is therefore urged.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: April 22, 2004

  
William M. Lee, Jr.  
Registration No. 26,935

Barnes & Thornburg LLP  
PO Box 2786  
Chicago IL 60690-2786  
(312) 357-1313 Telephone  
(312) 759-5646 Facsimile  
(312) 214-4800 Direct